

### **REMARKS**

Claims 56-137 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 57-73 and 90-137 are cancelled without prejudice. Claim 74 is amended by adding the features of claims 81 and 83, which are also cancelled without prejudice. Claim 56 is also amended to delete “polyisobutylene”, and the phrase “from 0.25 to 6 wt% of polyisobutylene” deleted from claim 74.

Also, claims 74 and 56 are amended by adding the feature “absent an LDPE”, which is derived from the specification as filed at Examples 6 and 9 and paragraph [0114] which states that the inventive films may be with or without additive polymers (“polymeric materials, if any”). No new matter has been added and such proposed amendments do not require an additional search or further consideration not already done by the Examiner.

Accordingly, entry of the foregoing amendments and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Obviousness**

Claims 56-137 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Lue et al.* (US 6,255,426; hereafter “Lue”) in view of *Takahashi et al.* (EP 0 982 362 A1; hereafter “Takahashi”) and *Wong et al.* (US 6,358,457; hereafter “Wong”). This rejection is traversed.

None of *Lue*, *Takahashi* or *Wong* disclose or suggest the claim features “applying a stretching force to the film before or during the step of wrapping the article with the stretch film”. The step of either post or pre-stretching the film is important to achieve its claimed advantages. Further, the films of *Takahashi* include a “high pressure radical process” LDPE, which is now absent from Applicant’s claimed invention. See in *Takahashi* the inventive (polymer “A” and “D” or “E” blend) and comparative (polymer “A” alone), and at paragraph [0009], and the broadest claim. Applicant’s invention offers the distinct advantage of having improved performance without the added cost of blending a LDPE into the core layer composition.

Further, those claimed advantages are exemplified in the working example data in Table 8, when compared to the comparative film made with metallocene resin EXCEED™ (made with a metallocene very similar to those of *Takahashi*) and comparative film made from the Ziegler catalyst DOWLEX™. Such inventive film features are reflected in the claimed feature: “a natural draw ratio of at least 250%, a tensile stress at the natural draw ratio of at least 22 MPa, and a tensile stress at second yield of at least 12 MPa, as measured according to ASTM D-882/97”. The EXCEED and DOWLEX films only approach the performance of the inventive films when LDPE is added. The films of *Lue*, *Takahashi* or *Wong* do not suggest such advantages upon post or pre-stretching the films.

Applicants thus request that the obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated. If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2002B117/2US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 12, 2008

/Kevin M. Faulkner/  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 45,427

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):  
ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Telephone No. (281) 834-5933  
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495